CHAPTER 2

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Bickford Ranch is proposed as a mixed-use development to include residential development ranging from medium density (5,000-7,400 square feet) to rural estates (3.0-10 acres). The Applicant proposes to develop the site with the maximum 1,950 dwelling units (as allowed under Appendix C of the Placer County General Plan) and construct a Village Center consisting of an 8-acre village commercial center for retail and commercial uses. The proposed land uses would substantially conform to the site's natural form and environmental attributes. A portion of the natural open space around the perimeter of the site would be preserved. The small-lot residential communities of the project are placed in the middle and along level portions of the property on Boulder Ridge. The design allows for natural open space and buffers to be maintained between the developed areas of the project and surrounding properties.

Residential

The development would consist of three distinct residential communities, named for the property's topographical features:

- The **Meadows** would be located along the east side of Sierra College Boulevard below the ridge and south of SR 193. Dotted with seven lakes ranging in size from 0.5-11 acres, this community would consist of 80 dwelling units with lots ranging from 1.0 acres to 10 acres that would include equestrian uses.

- The **Ridges** would be located along the sloped portions of the site above the Meadows and below the summit of the property. The community would consist of 923 dwelling units with lots ranging in size from 7,000 square feet to 10 acres.

- **Heritage Ridge** would be located along the top of Boulder Ridge from Sierra College Boulevard to just west of the antenna tower. This age-restricted community would consist of 947 dwelling units with lots ranging in size from 5,000 to 10,000 square feet; the community would include an 18-hole championship golf course and associated recreational amenities (i.e., driving range, clubhouse). The Heritage Ridge Homeowners Association would own, operate and maintain the golf facilities. The golf course and driving range will be available initially to the public, but the Homeowners Association may eventually restrict public access. It is the only golf course proposed within the Bickford Ranch Specific Plan area.

Commercial/Retail

The 8-acre Village Center would provide a typical concentration and mix of retail uses to meet daily shopping and service needs of project residents. A mail facility would be provided on this site.

Transit

A park-and-ride lot would be located within the Village Commercial site to accommodate car-pooling. Additionally, the proposed project includes two bus stops with sheltered benches to allow future transit opportunities. The locations of these bus stops are shown on Figure 3-11.

Circulation

In addition to the standard roadway improvements, separated delineated travel lanes for use of golf carts on Heritage Ridge Road within Heritage Ridge would be constructed. The golf cart transportation on the internal subdivision streets within Heritage Ridge would share a travel lane. The use of golf carts would allow for alternative means of transportation and would provide access to the golf course and clubhouse as well as to the Heritage Ridge residential neighborhoods. Golf cart access would also be provided to the Village Commercial, Village Recreation and driving range sites via golf lane street crossings on Bickford Ranch Road. Class II bike lanes are proposed along Bickford Ranch Road and Lower Ranch Road. Bicycles would not be permitted along the pedestrian trails/paths or on the equestrian paths.

Trails System

Within the internal natural open space corridors there would be a public pedestrian trail system, and around the perimeter of the site there would be a public equestrian trail system. The trail system would follow existing topography along streams and riparian areas, along and/or under power line easements, north of Boulder Ridge, and along roads.

Approximately 27 miles of open space corridors would connect the village center and communities of the proposed project, including 18.5 miles of public pedestrian and equestrian paths or trails. The pedestrian pathways would be constructed using native materials such as compacted decomposed granite. A total of 6.5 miles of public pedestrian corridors would primarily be located along internal streets with an additional 2 miles of walkways (sidewalks) within Heritage Ridge. The trail route may include ancillary elements such as shaded benches and drinking fountains for use by walkers and joggers. A total of 5 miles of equestrian trails would provide links to surrounding existing and planned equestrian trails to create a regional trail system.

Parks and Recreation

Other recreational amenities are proposed for use by residents of Bickford Ranch and the surrounding areas. The 56.8-acre Bickford Ranch Park incorporates three recreational activity areas: an equestrian area, a natural open space area, and a public park. Additional parks and facilities include the 3.7-acre public Tower Park, and Heritage Ridge's Recreational Center and Golf Course. They combine to provide a variety of recreational opportunities on the project site. The Applicant would build all recreation uses.

Bickford Ranch Park

Bickford Ranch Park will be a community facility encompassing 56.8 acres. It will include an equestrian area, a natural open space area, and an activity area. The equestrian area would contain a graded parking area and access to equestrian trails. The natural open space area consists of wetlands preserve areas. This space will provide for passive recreation opportunities such as pedestrian and equestrian trails. The activity area would include three baseball or softball fields, three soccer fields, a basketball court and tennis courts, turfed open spaces, tot lot, and group picnic area. No lighting, except where needed for security purposes, is proposed. All such lighting is subject to regulation under the Specific Plan Development Standards. No installation of public address systems is proposed.

Tower Park

This park would consist primarily of a turfed sports field for multi-use recreational activities such as baseball and soccer. Other features include a tot lot, playground, and picnic areas. A small stormwater detention pond is planned for the northwest side of the park site, within the turfed sports field. No

lighting, except where needed for security purposes, is proposed. All such lighting is subject to regulation under the Specific Plan Development Standards. No installation of public address systems is proposed.

Heritage Ridge Recreational Center

The Heritage Ridge Recreational Center would be located within the Heritage Ridge community. This center would be privately owned, operated, and maintained by the Heritage Ridge Homeowners Association and would feature recreational and social activities for senior adults. Active and passive recreational activities could include such services as meeting and instructional areas, golf activities, fitness equipment, tennis courts, and craft facilities. The clubhouse at the Recreational Center may also include a restaurant with indoor and outdoor dining and lounges.

Golf Course, Driving Range and Golf Maintenance Facilities

Heritage Ridge's 308-acre 18-hole championship golf course, along with a 21-acre driving range and ±3.5-acre maintenance facility, will be owned, operated and maintained by the Heritage Ridge Homeowners Association. The golf course and driving range will be available to the public, but the Homeowners Association may eventually restrict public access. The maintenance facility would be screened from adjacent uses with a minimum 6-foot high masonry perimeter wall and a landscape buffer including tree plantings. A secured entrance gate will be provided at the access point to the maintenance yard. The maintenance buildings will be used for office facilities, and storage by the golf course support and maintenance staff. Other buildings will also provide for equipment, parts and materials storage.

Fire Station Site

A 1.0-acre site for a fire station, located on Lower Ranch Road, would be dedicated to Placer County. A station at this site would serve the proposed project uses as well as neighboring uses to the west. The fire station would be constructed and partially equipped by the Applicant.

2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

This Draft EIR presents information concerning the environmental setting of the proposed project site, identifies potential project-related impacts and benefits to the environment, and recommends mitigation measures to reduce impacts. The environmental resources analyzed include land use; the socioeconomic environments; public facilities, services, and utilities; parks and recreation; transportation and circulation; air; noise; energy; soils, geology, and seismicity; hazardous waste; hydrology and water quality; biology; cultural resources; and visual resources. The proposed project's consistency with General Plan policies is separately analyzed in each resource chapter, and potential inconsistencies are summarized in Section 4.3.5.

A number of alternatives to the proposed project are also addressed in this Draft EIR. These alternatives are described in Section 2.3 below.

Table 2-2 at the end of this chapter summarizes the potential impacts of the proposed project by environmental resource. Impacts can be construction-related or they can be the short- and/or long-term result of project operation. The Applicant has worked with the County to anticipate and mitigate potential adverse environmental effects of the proposed project; these are identified in the sections which discuss each resource area. If an impact is determined to be significant or potentially significant, both Applicant-proposed mitigation and recommended mitigation measures (if applicable) are identified. These mitigation measures are also summarized on Table 2-2. Residual significance indicates the remaining level of significance after implementation of mitigation measures. An impact which remains significant after all mitigation is considered an unavoidable adverse impact of the proposed project.

The proposed project would result in several impacts which would remain significant or potentially significant after proposed plus recommended mitigation. These include:

- Conversion of land use from agricultural and open space to residential, recreational and commercial use
- Increased demand for public schools (potentially significant in the short term)
- Under 2010 General Plan conditions, I-80 west of Sierra College Boulevard and between Penryn and SR 49 would operate at LOS "F" conditions with or without the proposed project, based on a daily roadway segment level of service analysis (potentially significant)
- Potential unmet transit needs generated by the proposed project (potentially significant)
- Increase in regional criteria air pollutant emissions (short term)
- Inconsistent with the goals of the Placer County Air Quality Attainment Plan
- Sound level increases at noise-sensitive locations during construction (short-term)
- Loss of oak and other native trees
- Loss of oak woodland habitat
- Alteration of viewsheds for views to the northwest
- Reduction in visual quality within the study area
- Increase in night lighting in the project vicinity (potentially significant)
- Increase in glare in the project vicinity (potentially significant)
- Cumulative impacts related to
  - loss of open space
  - increased traffic congestion
  - increased traffic noise
  - increased ozone precursors and particulate emissions
  - biological resources
  - visual resources

The location of discussions related to environmental impacts in this Draft EIR is identified in Table 2-1 below.

2.3 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

A variety of project alternatives were considered by the Applicant. Alternatives considered were primarily related to the configuration and components of the project at the Bickford Ranch site. Alternative locations were also considered. To effectively evaluate alternatives, the project objectives were used to determine the reasonableness and feasibility of each alternative. A variety of alternatives that were considered by the Applicant, but were ultimately rejected, are described in Chapter 16. This Draft EIR considers seven alternatives to the proposed project, two of which are roadway alternatives, one of which is the No Project Alternative, and four of which are alternatives that vary in the density of housing and infrastructure that would be developed. The alternatives analyzed are described in detail in Chapter 16 and are summarized below.

Table 2-1
Consideration and Discussion of Environmental Impacts

Topic	Location of Discussion in this Draft EIR
Significant Environmental Effects of the Proposed Project	Summary in Table 2-2 Discussions in: • Impacts subsections of chapters 4 through 15 • Cumulative Impacts, subsection 16.5
Significant Environmental Effects which Cannot be Avoided if the Proposed Project is Implemented	Summary in Table 2-2 Subsection 2.2 above Discussions in: • Impacts subsections of chapters 4 through 15 • Subsection 16.2 • Subsection 16.5
Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes which Would be Involved in the Proposed Project Should it be Implemented	Subsection 16.3
Growth-Inducing Impacts of the Proposed Project	Subsection 16.4
Mitigation Measures Proposed to Minimize the Significant Effects	Summary in Table 2-2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures subsections of chapters 4 through 15.
Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Subsection 16.1

Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative

Under this alternative, the proposed project would not be developed. The basic landform at the site would remain in its present condition, and a residential community would not be constructed.

Alternative 2 – Reduced Density Alternative

In Alternative 2, the total number of units would be reduced and the majority of the amenities would be retained, although at a somewhat reduced level. A population of approximately 2,965 people is estimated for the 1,425 housing units developed for this alternative. An on-site wastewater treatment system would be constructed in the Meadows area, since this alternative would make construction of a sewer pipeline and the transporting of wastewater to Lincoln economically infeasible. Analysis for this alternative concluded that this Reduced Density alternative was environmentally preferred over the proposed project, primarily because the reduced impacts on public services, traffic, air, noise, and geology.

Alternative 3 – Conventional Housing Alternative

In this alternative, the project would be composed entirely of conventional units, and the age-restricted component would not be constructed. A population of approximately 3,705 people is estimated for the 1, 425 housing units to be developed in this alternative. The golf course, driving range and clubhouse would not be included and parks would be limited to a 22-acre equestrian park and the 15-acre Neighborhood Park. Natural open space would be reduced to the open space corridors. The on-site wastewater treatment system would be the same as Alternative 2. Spray irrigation, however, would take place in an open space area associated with the treatment plant rather than on the golf course (150 acres). Analysis for this alternative concluded that the proposed project was environmentally preferred over Alternative 3.

The benefits of a somewhat reduced population are outweighed by the significant loss of natural open space and park and recreation facilities.

Alternative 4 – Rural Residential Alternative

In Alternative 4, the entire site would be developed at the Farm 10-acre minimum zoning level, consistent with applicable subdivision ordinances and regulations of Placer County. The amenities identified for the proposed project and for the Reduced Density Alternative (Alternative 2) would not be constructed in Alternative 4. A total of 182 rural estate residential units would be constructed and a population of approximately 473 people is estimated for this alternative. Analysis for this alternative concluded that Alternative 4 was preferred over the proposed project, primarily due to the reduced level of development and greatly reduced population, which had a reduced impact on resources. Alternative 4 is not consistent with the project objectives.

Alternative 5 – Clark Tunnel Road Alternatives

Alternative 5 considers three configurations for Clark Tunnel Road as it leaves the project site from the north and from the southeast. In Sub-Alternative 5-1, vehicular access between SR 193 and the Penryn community via Clark Tunnel Road would be retained. In Sub-Alternative 5-2, Clark Tunnel Road would be closed at SR 193, but would remain open at the southeast portion of the project site, with direct access to the Penryn community. In Sub-Alternative 5-3, Clark Tunnel Road would remain open at SR 193, but would be closed at the southeast portion of the project site. Environmental analysis of each sub-alternative concluded that the proposed project was preferred over each Sub-Alternative based on traffic analysis and construction impacts.

Alternative 6 – Affordable Housing

In Alternative 6, affordable housing would be constructed on-site rather than mitigated through in-lieu fees, which would add 195 dwelling units to the proposed project and result in a population of approximately 5,421 people. Environmental analysis for this alternative concluded that it was less preferable than the proposed project, primarily due to the added impacts generated by the increased density of development and population.

Alternative 7 – Sierra College Boulevard Alternative

Alternative 7 considers road improvements to widen the western side of Sierra College Boulevard along its entire frontage of the project site. A third lane would be added. This alternative was analyzed in more detail than Alternatives 1 through 6 above. The level of analysis is similar to that for the proposed project in areas that differ from the proposed project. Analysis concluded that the proposed project was preferred over Alternative 7 due to impacts on biology and visual quality; although there was no clear preference for most of the resource areas.

Overall, the No Project Alternative was identified as the environmentally superior alternative. Among the other alternatives, Alternative 4, the Rural Residential Alternative, was identified as the environmentally superior "action" alternative. The alternatives and analyses are described in more detail for each environmental resource in Chapter 16 of this Draft EIR.

2.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Aspects of the proposed project that could be of public concern include the following:

- Conversion of land use from agricultural and open space;
- Introduction of approximately 4,300 new residents into a rural, undeveloped area;
- Compatibility with surrounding rural residential areas;
- School and fire district services to the proposed project;
- Increase in traffic and noise;
- Proposal for privacy gates;
- Lack of on-site affordable housing;
- Potential impacts of increased runoff from the site;
- Loss of biological resources, including oak trees, oak woodland habitat, special-status plant habitat, vernal pool and wetland habitat, and possible degradation of aquatic habitats and wetlands; and,
- Alteration of viewsheds reducing the visual quality of the study area.

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
LAND USE				
L-1: Conversion of land use from agricultural and open space to residential, recreational and commercial uses	Significant	None	None	Significant
L-2: Change in interface of development with surrounding land uses	Less Than Significant	Mitigation Measure L-A (Design project elements to buffer the project from adjacent uses)	None	Less Than Significant
L-3: Compatibility with surrounding agricultural uses	Less Than Significant	Mitigation Measure L-A (Design project elements to buffer the project from adjacent uses)	None	Less Than Significant
L-4: Conversion of land from agricultural to residential, recreational and commercial uses	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
L-5: Deleted			Mitigation Measure L-B deleted	
L-6: Inconsistency with General Plan policy 1.B.9 discouraging development of isolated, remote, and/or walled residential projects	Significant	None	Mitigation Measure L-C (Limit construction of gates)	Less Than Significant
POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING				
PH-1: Increase in the population of unincorporated Placer County	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
PH-2: Increase in employment opportunities in Placer County	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
PH-3: Increase in the supply of housing in south Placer County	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
PH-4: Increase in the need for affordable housing	Significant	Mitigation Measure PH-A (Pay unspecified in-lieu fees) Significant	Mitigation Measure PH-B (Construct on-site affordable residential units) or PH-C (Pay a per unit in-lieu affordable housing fee, such fee to be calculated based on unit cost, affordable rent, and interest rate current as of the time payment is made, and calculated in a manner similar to that identified in the DEIR)	Less Than Significant

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
PH-5: Potential effect on the jobs-housing balance in the study area	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
PH-6: Inconsistency with Placer County General Policy 2.A.11 requiring that all new housing projects of 100 or more units, having received an increase in allowable density through a specific plan, shall provide affordable housing, unless impractical	Significant	Mitigation Measure PH-A (Pay unspecified in-lieu fees) Significant	Mitigation Measure PH-B (Construct on-site affordable residential units)	Less Than Significant
PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES				
Water				
PS-1: Increased demand for treated surface water	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
PS-2: Increased demand for raw water from Caperton and Antelope canals	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
PS-3: Increased demand for groundwater	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
PS-4: Increased demand for surface water treatment	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
PS-5: Temporary (short-term) shortage of water supply if planned pipeline construction falls behind schedule	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure PS-A (Provide will-serve letter and participate in the Penryn/Lincoln/Sunset pipeline)	None	Less Than Significant
PS-6: Potential contamination of potable water supply where proposed pipeline crosses under storm drainage culverts in Butler Road	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure PS-B (Provide water pipeline improvements)	None	Less Than Significant
Wastewater				
PS-7: Increased demand for sewage conveyance to wastewater treatment plant	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
PS-8: Odor and blockages due to low wastewater flows	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure PS-C (Provide for increased hydraulic loading, maintenance, or special design to prevent odor and blockages in off-site sewer pipelines until flows from other sources are sufficient to ensure velocity, if and when such conditions arise)	None	Less Than Significant
PS-9: Public safety hazard due to maintenance activities along the alignment of the sewer pipeline	Potentially Significant	None	Mitigation Measure PS-D (Prepare and implement traffic and safety plan for maintenance of off-site sewer line)	Less Than Significant
PS-10: Potential water quality impacts to Auburn Ravine or groundwater due to leakage from sewer pipeline	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures PS-E (Design off-site sewer pipeline per Placer County requirements); and PS-F (Design off-site sewer pipeline with watertight joints)	None	Less Than Significant
Wastewater Treatment				
PS-11: Increased demand on wastewater treatment system	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures PS-G (Participate in construction of additional wastewater treatment capacity to accommodate projected flows); and PS-H (Issue building permits only when sufficient wastewater treatment capacity exists or will exist at time of sewer connection)	None	Less Than Significant
Electricity/Gas/Energy				
PS-12: Increased demand on electric supply	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
PS-13: Increased demand on the electrical distribution network	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
PS-14: Potential for effects of electromagnetic fields	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
PS-15: Increased demand on natural gas supply	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
PS-16: Increased demand on the natural gas distribution system	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
PS-17: Increase in the consumption of energy resources during project operation	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
Parks and Recreation				
PS-18: Dedication of an adequate supply of parkland and related facilities	Beneficial	None Warranted	None Warranted	
PS-19: Increased demand for existing public parks and recreational facilities for new residents	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
PS-20: Improvements/extension of existing bicycle and equestrian trail systems	Beneficial	None Warranted	None Warranted	
PS-21: Development of private recreational facilities	Beneficial	None Warranted	None Warranted	
Other County/Community Services				
PS-22: Increased demand on public services	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
PS-23: Increased demand for public schools	Significant	Mitigation Measure PS-I (Pay statutory fees to existing school district(s))	None	Potentially Significant (short-term); Less Than Significant (long-term)
PS-24: Increased demand for fire protection service	Significant	Mitigation Measure PS-J (Donate a site, construct, and partially equip a fire station) Less Than Significant	Mitigation Measures PS-K (Establish Fire District jurisdiction and emergency response standards for the project); and PS-L (Pursue single jurisdiction fire service)	Less Than Significant

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
PS-25: Potential interference with emergency fire access due to driveways built on steep slopes	Significant	Mitigation Measures PS-M (Grade driveways to slopes of 15 percent or less at the time of home construction; a Grading Permit will be required for those identified lots prior to the issuance of a Building Permit); PS-N (Pave driveways with asphaltic concrete or concrete at the time of home construction on driveways with slopes of 16 to 20 percent; a Grading Permit will be required for those identified lots prior to issuance of a Building Permit); and PS-O (Prohibit development on lots with driveway access in excess of 20 percent)	None	Less Than Significant
PS-26: Increased demand for solid waste hauling	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
PS-27: Increased demand for solid waste disposal	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
PS-28: Increased demand for telephone and cable services	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) / Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION				
T-1: Short-term traffic impacts related to project construction	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures T-A (Prepare and implement construction traffic management plans for on-site construction activities for Bickford Ranch Road and Sierra College Boulevard, and coordinate with appropriate agencies in the preparation and implementation of construction traffic management plans for required off-site improvements); and T-B (Implement a community relations program during on-site construction, and coordinate with appropriate agencies in the implementation of a community relations program during construction of required on-site and off-site improvements)	None	Less Than Significant
T-2: Under Existing Plus Project conditions, traffic operations at the intersection of Sierra College Boulevard and I-80 westbound ramps in Rocklin would worsen from LOS "C" to LOS "F" during the p.m. peak hour. The intersection of Sierra College Boulevard and I-80 eastbound ramps would worsen from LOS "C" to LOS "E" during the a.m. peak hour and from LOS "D" to LOS "F" during the p.m. peak hour	Significant	Mitigation Measure T-C (Pay pro-rata fair share of reconstruction of the I-80/Sierra College Boulevard Interchange)	None	Less Than Significant
T-3: Under Existing Plus Project conditions, traffic operations on the eastbound stop-sign controlled approach of King Road at Sierra College Boulevard in Loomis would worsen from LOS "B" to LOS "D" during the p.m. peak hour	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) / Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
T-4: Under Existing Plus Project conditions, Sierra College Boulevard between Taylor Road and Granite Drive in Rocklin would worsen from LOS "A" to LOS "E", and Sierra College Boulevard between Granite Drive and I-80 in Rocklin would worsen from LOS "D" to LOS "F" based on a daily roadway segment level of service analysis	Significant	Mitigation Measure T-D (Pay pro-rata fair share to widen Sierra College Boulevard from two to four lanes from Taylor Road to I-80)	None	Less Than Significant
T-5: Under 2010 General Plan Plus Project conditions, the intersection of SR 193 and SR 65 would operate at LOS "E" conditions during the a.m. peak hour and LOS "F" conditions during the p.m. peak hour with or without the proposed project	Significant	Mitigation Measure T-E (Pay Placer County traffic mitigation fees)	None	Less Than Significant
T-6: Under 2010 General Plan Plus Project conditions, the westbound stop-sign controlled approach of Lower Ranch Road at Sierra College Boulevard would operate at LOS "E" conditions during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
T-7: Under 2010 General Plan Plus Project conditions, the proposed project would cause operations on the westbound stop-sign controlled approach of Del Mar Avenue at Sierra College Boulevard in Loomis to worsen from LOS "E" to LOS "F" during the a.m. peak hour, and from LOS "D" to LOS "F" in the p.m. peak hour. The eastbound approach would worsen from LOS "D" to LOS "F" during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) / Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
T-8: Under 2010 General Plan Plus Project conditions, the proposed project would cause operations at the intersection of Sierra College Boulevard and Taylor Road in Loomis to worsen from LOS "D" to LOS "E" during both a.m. and p.m. peak hours	Significant	Mitigation Measure T-F (Pay pro-rata fair share of adding a second westbound left-turn lane on Taylor Road at the Sierra College Boulevard intersection)	None	Less Than Significant
T-9: Under 2010 General Plan Plus Project conditions, the proposed project would cause Sierra College Boulevard between Taylor Road and Granite Drive in Rocklin to worsen from LOS "D" to LOS "E", based on a daily roadway segment level of service analysis	Significant	Mitigation Measure T-G (Pay pro-rata fair share of widening Sierra College Boulevard from four to six lanes from Taylor Road to Granite Drive)	None	Less Than Significant
T-10: Under 2010 General Plan conditions, the traffic volume on English Colony Way between Sierra College Boulevard and Clark Tunnel Road would reach a recommended threshold for safety improvements with or without the proposed project	Significant	None	Mitigation Measure T-H (Pay pro-rata fair share of the cost to add shoulders and improve vertical and horizontal curves along English Colony Way)	Less Than Significant
T-11: Under 2010 General Plan conditions, I-80 west of Sierra College Boulevard and between Penryn and SR 49 would operate at LOS "F" conditions with or without the proposed project, based on a daily roadway segment level of service analysis	Significant	Mitigation Measure T-I (Participate in any development-based funding of solutions to I-80 congestion if adopted by Placer County)	None	Potentially Significant
T-12: Under Buildout of Project Vicinity Plus Project conditions, the intersection of SR 193 and SR 65 would operate at LOS "F" conditions during the p.m. peak hour with or without the proposed project	Significant	Mitigation Measure T-E (Pay Placer County traffic mitigation fees)	None	Less Than Significant

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) / Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
T-13: Under the Buildout of Project Vicinity Plus Project conditions, the westbound stop-sign controlled approach of Lower Ranch Road at Sierra College Boulevard would operate at LOS "E" conditions during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
T-14: Under the Buildout of Project Vicinity Plus Project conditions, the proposed project would cause operations at the intersection of Sierra College Boulevard and Twelve Bridges Drive to worsen from LOS "C" to LOS "D" during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours	Significant	None	Mitigation Measure T-J (Pay pro-rata fair share of adding a second northbound left-turn lane on Sierra College Boulevard at Twelve Bridges Drive intersection)	Less Than Significant
T-15: Under the Buildout of Project Vicinity Plus Project conditions, the eastbound and westbound stop-sign controlled approaches on Del Mar Avenue would operate at LOS "F" during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours with or without the proposed project	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
T-16: Under the Buildout of Project Vicinity Plus Project conditions, the proposed project would cause operations at the intersection of Sierra College Boulevard and King Road in Loomis to worsen from LOS "C" to LOS "D" during the p.m. peak hour	Significant	Mitigation Measure T-K (Pay pro-rata fair share of adding a westbound right-turn lane on King Road at Sierra College Boulevard intersection)	None	Less Than Significant
T-17: Under the Buildout of Project Vicinity Plus Project conditions, the intersection of English Colony and Taylor Road would operate at LOS "D" during the p.m. peak hour with or without the proposed project	Significant	Mitigation Measure T-L (Pay pro-rata fair share of adding right-turn lanes in both directions on Taylor Road at the English Colony Way intersection)	None	Less Than Significant

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
T-18: Under the Buildout of Project Vicinity Plus Project conditions, the proposed project would cause sections of Sierra College Boulevard to operate at unacceptable levels of service based on a daily roadway segment level of service analysis	Significant	Mitigation Measures T-F (Pay pro-rata fair share of adding a second westbound left-turn lane on Taylor Road at Sierra College Boulevard intersection); T-G (Pay pro-rata fair share of widening Sierra College Boulevard from four to six lanes from Taylor Road to Granite Drive); and T-K (Pay pro-rata fair share of adding a westbound right-turn lane on King Road at Sierra College Boulevard intersection) Significant	Mitigation Measure T-J (Pay pro-rata fair share of adding a second northbound left-turn lane on Sierra College Boulevard at Twelve Bridges Drive intersection)	Less Than Significant
T-19: Potential unmet transit needs generated by the proposed project	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure T-M (Provide park-and-ride lot and two bus stops); and T-N (Participate in fair share of the cost of limited transit services)	None	Potentially Significant
Bicycle Impacts				
T-20: Increased demand for recreational and transportation related bicycle trips	Less Than Significant	Mitigation Measure T-O (Provide Class II bike lanes on Bickford Ranch Road and Lower Ranch Road)	None	Less Than Significant
Golf Cart Circulation				
T-21: Safety concerns at two golf cart crossings on Bickford Ranch Road	Significant	Mitigation Measures T-P (Provide signing and striping on Bickford Ranch Road at the golf cart crossings); and T-Q (Work with Placer County to define an acceptable Golf Cart Crossing Plan)	None	Less Than Significant

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) / Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
T-22: Inconsistency with Placer County General Plan Policy 3.A.2 requiring that all streets and roads shall be dedicated, widened, and constructed according to the roadway design and access standards in the General Plan	Significant	None	Mitigation Measure T-R (Construct a third lane on Sierra College Boulevard opposite the project boundaries)	Less Than Significant
T-23: Based on the standards of significance for traffic impacts, a significant impact occurs in the 2010 General Plan Plus Project and Buildout of Project Vicinity Plus Project scenarios, due to LOS "E" conditions on the westbound minor street approach to the intersection of Sierra College Boulevard and the unnamed road north of Lower Ranch Road, south of SR 193.	Significant	None	Mitigation Measure T-S (Install traffic signal at the intersection of Sierra College Boulevard and the unnamed road north of Lower Ranch Road, south of SR 193)	Less Than Significant
AIR QUALITY				
A-1: Construction activities would create short-term criteria air pollutant emissions	Significant (short-term); Less Than Significant (long-term)	Mitigation Measures G-B (Prepare and implement a grading and erosion control plan); A-A (Provide dust controls); A-B (Maintain construction equipment and vehicles); A-C (Implement a construction worker trip reduction program); A-D (Require use of low-emission construction materials and equipment where feasible); and T-A (Prepare and implement construction traffic management plans for on-site construction activities for Bickford Ranch Road and Sierra College Boulevard, and coordinate with appropriate agencies in the preparation and implementation of construction traffic management plans for required off-site improvements)	None	Significant (short-term); Less Than Significant (long-term)

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
A-2: Increase in localized CO concentrations along affected roadways	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
A-3: Increase in regional criteria air pollutant emissions	Significant	Mitigation Measures A-E (Incorporate pedestrian, bicycle, and golf-cart oriented design); T-O (Provide Class II bike lanes on Bickford Ranch Road and Lower Ranch Road); T-M (Provide a park-and-ride lot and two bus stops); A-F (Incorporate mixed land uses into the project design to reduce external vehicle trips); A-G (Accommodate and encourage low-emission energy use); A-H (Install only natural gas CNG fireplaces); A-I (Provide public awareness materials); A-J (Incorporate into project CC&Rs the prohibition of open burning of any kind); and A-K (Implement an off-site mitigation program to reduce 105 percent of long-term air pollutant emissions) Less Than Significant	Mitigation Measures A-L (Provide dedicated parking spaces at the park-and-ride lot with electrical outlets for electric vehicles); and T-N (Participate in fair share of the cost of limited transit services)	Less Than Significant

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
A-4: Inconsistent with the goals of the Placer County Air Quality Attainment Plan	Significant	Mitigation Measures A-E (Incorporate pedestrian, bicycle, and golf-cart oriented design); A-F (Incorporate mixed land uses into the project design to reduce external vehicle trips); A-G (Accommodate and encourage low-emission energy use); A-H (Install only natural gas CNG fireplaces); A-I (Provide public awareness materials); A-J (Incorporate into project CC&Rs the prohibition of open burning of any kind); T-M (Provide park-and-ride lot and two bus stops); T-N (Participate in fair share of the cost of limited transit services); and T-O (Provide Class II bike lanes on Bickford Ranch Road and Lower Ranch Road)	None	Significant
NOISE				
N-1: Construction equipment would generate short-term sound level increases at noise-sensitive locations	Significant (short-term)	Mitigation Measures N-A (Restrict hours of construction activity); N-B (Prior to grading or improvement plan approval, develop and implement a construction equipment noise abatement program); and T-B (Implement a community relations program during on-site construction, and coordinate with appropriate agencies in the implementation of a community relations program during construction of required on-site and off-site improvements)	None	Significant (short-term)

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
N-2: Construction traffic would generate short-term sound level increases at noise sensitive locations	Significant (short-term)	Mitigation Measures N-C (Develop and implement a construction traffic noise abatement program to include restriction of construction truck traffic on non-major roads); and T-B (Implement a community relations program during on-site construction, and coordinate with appropriate agencies in the implementation of a community relations program during construction of required on-site and off-site improvements)	None	Less Than Significant
N-3: Project-generated increase in 24-hour average traffic noise levels at off-site locations	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
N-4: Introduction of noise-sensitive receptors to a potentially noise-impacted area	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures N-D (Incorporate building setbacks and noise barriers into the proposed project design); N-E (Inform prospective buyers of potential rail noise exposure exceeding 60 dBA L_{dn}); N-F (Implement community park design measures to minimize potential noise impacts); N-G (Inform potential buyers of potential community noise sources); N-H (Restrict the timing and location of truck deliveries to the Village Commercial Center); N-I (Require 6-foot block or masonry walls along project roadways where residential areas would fall within the 60 dBA L_{dn} contour); and N-J (Restrict business hours of operation within specified areas of the Village Commercial Center) Potentially Significant	None	Less Than Significant

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
SOILS, GEOLOGY, AND SEISMICITY				
G-1: Topographic alteration resulting from earth grading	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures G-A (Comply with Placer County ordinances for all grading, drainage and construction of improvements); G-B (Prepare and implement a grading and erosion control plan); V-B (Implement sensitive grading techniques to blend with natural setting); and V-C (Minimize grading within Meadows and Ridges developments)	None	Less Than Significant
G-2: Development constraints due to difficult excavation conditions	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure G-C (Comply with the conclusions of a site-specific geotechnical investigation)	None	Less Than Significant
G-3: Mineral resources rendered inaccessible	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
G-4: Potential for seismic activity	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
G-5: Potential for increased erosion during and after construction	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures G-A (Comply with Placer County ordinances for all grading, drainage, and construction of improvements); G-B (Prepare and implement a grading and erosion control plan); G-C (Comply with the conclusions of a site-specific geotechnical investigation); and A-A (Provide dust controls) Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure G-D (Implement appropriate trail design, construction and maintenance standards to minimize erosion)	Less Than Significant

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
G-6: Differential settlement of soils under proposed structures	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures G-A (Comply with Placer County ordinances for all grading, drainage and construction of improvements); G-B (Prepare and implement a grading and erosion control plan); and G-C (Comply with the conclusions of a site-specific geotechnical investigation)	None	Less Than Significant
G-7: Foundation instability	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure G-C (Comply with the conclusions of a site-specific geotechnical investigation)	None	Less Than Significant
G-8: Slope instability	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures G-B (Prepare and submit a grading and erosion control plan); and G-C (Comply with the conclusions of a site-specific geotechnical investigation)	None	Less Than Significant
G-9: Limited effectiveness of septic tank leach fields due to soil conditions	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure H-J (Implement Placer County policies and ordinances related to permitting, design, construction and maintenance of septic systems)	None	Less Than Significant
HAZARDOUS WASTE/MATERIALS				
HW-1 Potential contact with stored hazardous waste/materials during construction	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
HW-2 Possible contact with contaminated soils during construction	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure HW-A (Report possible contamination to EHS-HMS)	None	Less Than Significant

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
HW-3: Accidental release of hazardous substances during construction	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures HW-B (Comply with CDF and Penryn Fire Department requirements for temporary storage of combustible/flammable liquids at construction sites); and HW-C (Comply with County and CDF requirements for reporting releases of hazardous materials)	None	Less Than Significant
HW-4 Potential groundwater contamination	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure HW-D (Comply with the recommendations of a limited groundwater investigation)	None	Less Than Significant
HW-5: Possible contact with hazardous materials and conditions in mine tunnels	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure B-N (Install bat gates at tunnel entrances)	None	Less Than Significant
HW-6: Accidental release of hazardous substances after construction	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures HW-C (Comply with County and CDF requirements for reporting releases of hazardous materials); HW-E (Comply with the Placer County Department of Environmental Health requirements for preparation and filing of Emergency Response Plans and Hazardous Materials Storage and Containment Plans); HW-F (Finalize and implement the Applicant's Golf Course Chemical Application Management Plan); and HW-G (Comply with underground storage tank regulations through the Placer County Environmental Health Department)	None	Less Than Significant

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY				
Surface Water Hydrology				
H-1: Increase in runoff rate downstream of the site	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures H-A (Prepare and implement a post-development stormwater management program); and H-B (Provide runoff rate control)	None	Less Than Significant
H-2: Increase in runoff volume leaving the site	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure H-C (Provide retention storage)	None	Less Than Significant
Water Quality				
H-3: Reduced storm water quality due to increased erosion and sedimentation during construction	Potentially Significant (short-term)	Mitigation Measures G-B (Prepare and implement a grading and erosion control plan); H-D (Prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan for construction activities); and H-E (Monitor erosion and sediment control measures during construction)	None	Less Than Significant
H-4: Reduced storm water chemical quality due to construction activities	Potentially Significant (short-term)	Mitigation Measure H-D (Prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan for construction activities)	None	Less Than Significant
H-5: Increased erosion and sedimentation after buildout	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures G-B (Prepare and implement a grading and erosion control plan); H-A (Prepare and implement a post-development stormwater management program); H-F (Monitor site erosion and sediment control measures for two years after implementation of final erosion control measures); and H-G (Design runoff detention basins to promote solids settling and provide capacity for accumulated sediment)	None	Less Than Significant

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
H-6: Reduced storm water runoff quality after buildout (excluding sedimentation)	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures HW-F (Finalize and implement the Applicant's Golf Course Chemical Application Management Plan); H-A (Prepare and implement a post-development stormwater management program); and H-H (Finalize and implement the Applicant's Lake Management Plan for constructed lakes and wetlands areas) Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure H-I (Design and construct improvements to protect water quality in canals in accordance with PCWA standards and County requirements for a 100-foot setback from structures)	Less Than Significant
H-7: Reduced groundwater quality	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures HW-F (Finalize and implement the Applicant's Golf Course Chemical Application Management Plan); H-H (Finalize and implement the Applicant's Lake Management Plan for constructed lakes and wetland areas); H-J (Implement Placer County policies and ordinances related to permitting, design, construction, and maintenance of septic systems); and H-K (Notify Placer County Department of Environmental Health and affected property owners if off-site sewer pipeline breaks)	None	Less Than Significant
H-8: Loss of groundwater recharge opportunity	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
BIOLOGY				
B-1: Loss of annual grassland	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	Mitigation Measure B-S (Preserve and enhance annual grassland vegetation adjacent to golf course)	Less Than Significant

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
B-2: Loss of oak and other native trees	Significant	Mitigation Measure B-A (Implement the Applicant's oak forest conservation and revegetation plan); and B-B (Hire a project biologist for construction monitoring) Significant	Mitigation Measures B-C (Implement off-site tree mitigation); and B-D (Implement a tree protection plan)	Significant
B-3: Loss of oak woodland habitat	Significant	Mitigation Measure B-A (Implement the Applicant's oak forest conservation and revegetation plan); and B-B (Hire a project biologist for construction monitoring) Significant	Mitigation Measures B-C (Implement off-site tree mitigation); and B-D (Implement a tree protection plan)	Significant
B-4: Potential loss of riparian vegetation	Significant	Mitigation Measures B-A (Implement the Applicant's oak forest conservation and revegetation plan); B-B (Hire a project biologist for construction monitoring); and B-E (Implement the Applicant's wetland preservation and impact plan) Significant	Mitigation Measures B-C (Implement off-site tree mitigation); B-D (Implement a tree protection plan); and B-F (Protect riparian buffer zones)	Less Than Significant
B-5: Loss of special-status plant habitat	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure B-B (Hire a project biologist for construction monitoring) Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure B-G (Conduct pre-construction surveys for special-status plants)	Less Than Significant
B-6: Loss of vernal pool fairy shrimp habitat	Significant	Mitigation Measure B-H (Compensate for loss of vernal pool fairy shrimp habitat)	None	Less Than Significant

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
B-7: Loss of valley elderberry longhorn beetle habitat	Significant	Mitigation Measures B-B (Hire a project biologist for construction monitoring); and B-I (Protect VELB habitat [elderberry shrubs] during construction) Significant	Mitigation Measure B-J (Compensate for loss of VELB habitat [elderberry shrubs])	Less Than Significant
B-8: Loss of fish habitat as a result of degradation in water quality during construction	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures G-A (Comply with Placer County ordinances for all grading, drainage and construction of improvements); G-B (Prepare and implement a grading and erosion control plan); H-D (Prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan for construction activities); and H-E (Monitor erosion and sediment control measures during construction)	None	Less Than Significant
B-9: Loss of California red-legged frog habitat	Significant	Mitigation Measures G-A (Comply with Placer County ordinances for all grading, drainage, and construction of improvements); G-B (Prepare and implement a grading and erosion control plan); H-D (Prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan for construction activities); and H-E (Monitor erosion and sediment control measures during construction)	None	Less Than Significant

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
B-10: Loss of foothill yellow-legged frog habitat	Significant	Mitigation Measures G-A (Comply with Placer County ordinances for all grading, drainage, and construction of improvements); G-B (Prepare and implement a grading and erosion control plan); H-D (Prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan for construction activities); and H-E (Monitor erosion and sediment control measures during construction) Significant	Mitigation Measure B-F (Protect riparian buffer zones)	Less Than Significant
B-11: Loss of raptor nests	Significant	Mitigation Measures B-L (Conduct preconstruction surveys for nesting raptors in affected areas); and B-M (Develop buffer zones around nesting raptors during construction)	None	Less Than Significant
B-12: Possible disturbance and harm to roosting special-status bats	Significant	Mitigation Measures B-B (Hire a project biologist for construction monitoring); and B-N (Install bat gates at tunnel entrances)	None	Less Than Significant

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
B-13: Loss and degradation of waters of the United States, including wetlands	Significant	Mitigation Measures G-A (Comply with the Placer County ordinances for all grading, drainage, and construction of improvements); B-E (Implement the Applicant's wetland preservation and impact plan); G-B (Prepare and implement a grading and erosion control plan); H-D (Prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan for construction activities); H-E (Monitor erosion and sediment control measures during construction); B-O (Obtain and implement conditions of state and federal permits for impacts on waters of the United States); and B-P (Protect wetlands during construction)	None	Less Than Significant
B-14: Loss of common wildlife species	Less Than Significant	None Warranted	None Warranted	
B-15: Additional loss of oak trees during project operation phase	Potentially Significant	None	Mitigation Measures B-D (Implement a tree protection plan); and B-Q (Develop and implement an open space management plan)	Potentially Significant
B-16: Loss of blackberry riparian habitat during fire management activities	Significant	None	Mitigation Measure B-R (Avoid removal of blackberry riparian vegetation)	Less Than Significant

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
B-17: Degradation of fish habitat as a result of degradation in water quality	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures H-A (Prepare and implement a post-development stormwater management program); H-F (Monitor site erosion and sediment control measures for two years after implementation of final erosion control measures); HW-F (Finalize and implement the Applicant's Golf Course Chemical Application Management Plan); and H-G (Design runoff detention basins to promote solids settling and provide capacity for accumulated sediment) Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure B-F (Protect riparian buffer zones)	Less Than Significant
B-18: Degradation of aquatic habitats for California red-legged frog, foothill yellow-legged frog, and northwestern pond turtle	Significant	Mitigation Measures H-A (Prepare and implement a post-development stormwater management program); H-F (Monitor site erosion and sediment control measures for two years after implementation of final erosion control measures); H-G (Design runoff detention basins to promote solids settling and provide capacity for accumulated sediment); HW-F (Finalize and implement the Applicant's Golf Course Chemical Application Management Plan); and H-H (Finalize and implement the Applicant's Lake Management Plan for constructed lakes and wetland areas) Significant	Mitigation Measure B-R (Avoid removal of blackberry riparian vegetation)	Less Than Significant

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
B-19: Degradation of wetlands and other waters of the United States during project operation phase	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures H-A (Prepare and implement a post-development stormwater management program); H-F (Monitor site erosion and sediment control measures for two years after implementation of final erosion control measures); and H-H (Finalize and implement the Applicant's Lake Management Plan for constructed lakes and wetland areas)	None	Less Than Significant
CULTURAL RESOURCES				
C-1: Damage to important cultural resources during construction	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures C-A (Incorporate important cultural resources into open space); C-B (Cap resource area with layer of soil prior to construction); and C-C (Conduct data recovery excavation if capping is infeasible)	None	Less Than Significant
C-2: Damage to potentially important cultural resources during construction	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures C-A (Incorporate important cultural resources into open space); *or* C-D (Conduct subsurface testing) if ground disturbing activities are to occur within 100 feet of unevaluated resource. If subsurface deposits are encountered and the resource is determined to be important and Mitigation Measure C-A remains infeasible, then Mitigation Measure C-B (Cap resource area with layer of soil prior to construction) or Mitigation Measure C-C (Conduct data recovery excavation if capping is infeasible) would be necessary.	None	Less Than Significant

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
C-3: Damage to cultural resources including archaeological artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone if inadvertently exposed during construction	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure C-E (Immediately stop ground disturbing activities in vicinity and consult qualified professional archeologist, the Placer County Planning Department, the Department of Museums, and the County Coroner, if buried cultural deposits are discovered during construction. The County Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission if it is determined that the remains are Native American. Construction crews will be trained in the identification of archaeological resources prior to commencing ground-disturbing activities. This training will include: (1) proper identification of archaeological deposits; (2) the procedures to be followed in the event of such a discovery; (3) an understanding of the importance of protecting cultural resources; and (4) an overview of applicable laws, statutes and ordinances. Training will be conducted by a qualified archaeologist in person, and written materials will be provided to each trained crew member, who will be required to sign that he or she has received the training, understands it, and agrees to abide by it.)	None	Less Than Significant
C-4: Damage to paleontological resources inadvertently exposed during construction	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure C-F (Retain a qualified professional paleontologist to conduct weekly inspections during grading activities and salvage fossils as necessary)	None	Less Than Significant

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
VISUAL RESOURCES				
V-1: Alteration of viewsheds within the study area from rural residences, residences in adjacent subdivision, and travel routes	Significant	Mitigation Measures V-A (Provide transition areas and buffers between residential development and natural open space); V-B (Implement sensitive grading techniques to blend with natural setting); V-C (Minimize grading within Meadows and Ridges developments); V-D (Apply selected lot restrictions); V-E (Retain hill at the intersection of SR 193 and Sierra College Boulevard); V-I (For all lots containing slopes of 30 percent or greater, record on final map and reflect in the development notebook for such lots a slope easement at the 30 percent slope starting point. No building envelopes or structures shall be permitted on the portion of the lot where slopes are 30 percent or greater); V-J (For all lots containing slopes of 30 percent or greater, structures and building envelopes shall be prohibited on those portions of the lot where slopes are 30 percent or greater); V-K (For all lots containing slopes of 30 percent or greater, prohibit development on those portions of the lot where slopes are 30 percent or greater); and G-B (Prepare and implement a grading and erosion control plan) Significant for views to Zone 1 and Zone 6; Less Than Significant for views to Zones 2 through 5	Mitigation Measure V-H (Apply selected lot restrictions to other areas of concern)	Significant for views to Zone 1 and Zone 6; Less Than Significant for views to Zones 2 through 5

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
V-2: Reduction in visual quality within the study area, resulting in strong project/setting contrast	Significant	Mitigation Measures V-A (Provide transition areas and buffers between residential development and natural open space); V-B (Implement sensitive grading techniques to blend with natural setting); V-C (Minimize grading within Meadows and Ridges developments); V-D (Apply selected lot restrictions); V-I (For all lots containing slopes of 30 percent or greater, record on final map and reflect in the development notebook for such lots a slope easement at the 30 percent slope starting point. No building envelopes or structures shall be permitted on the portion of the lot where slopes are 30 percent or greater); V-J (For all lots containing slopes of 30 percent or greater, structures and building envelopes shall be prohibited on those portions of the lot where slopes are 30 percent or greater); V-K (For all lots containing slopes of 30 percent or greater, prohibit development on those portions of the lot where slopes are 30 percent or greater); and G-B (Prepare and implement a grading and erosion control plan) Significant	Mitigation Measure V-H (Apply selected lot restrictions to other areas of concern)	Significant
V-3: Increase in night lighting in the project vicinity	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures V-F (Implement lighting standards outlined in Design Guidelines); and V-L (Revise lighting design guidelines)	None	Potentially Significant

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
V-4: Increase in glare in the project vicinity	Significant	Mitigation Measures V-G (Implement Architectural Standards resulting in reduction in glare) and V-L (Revise lighting design guidelines)	None	Potentially Significant
V-5: Inconsistency with Placer County General Plan policies 1.K.1, 1.K.6.d, and 1.O.3 requiring that new development be designed to be compatible with the scale and character of the area, avoid locating structures along ridgelines and steep slopes, and minimize visibility	Significant	Mitigation Measure V-A (Provide transition areas and buffers between residential development and natural open space); V-B (Implement sensitive grading techniques to blend with natural setting); V-C (Minimize grading within Meadows and Ridges developments); V-D (Apply selected lot restrictions); V-I (For all lots containing slopes of 30 percent or greater, record on final map and reflect in the development notebook for such lots a slope easement at the 30 percent slope starting point. No building construction envelopes or structures shall be permitted on the portion of the lot where slopes are 30 percent or greater); V-J (For all lots containing slopes of 30 percent or greater, structures and building envelopes shall be prohibited on those portions of the lot where slopes are 30 percent or greater); and V-K (For all lots containing slopes of 30 percent or greater, prohibit development on those portions of the lot where slopes are 30 percent or greater) Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measure V-H (Apply selected lot restrictions to other areas of concern)	Less Than Significant

Table 2-2
Impact Summary Table – Proposed Project

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures		Residual Significance
		Proposed (by Applicant) Significance After Mitigation	Recommended (by EIR)	
Cumulative Impacts: • loss of open space • increased traffic congestion • increased traffic noise • increased ozone precursors and particulate emissions • biological resources • visual resources	Significant	As proposed by Applicant, above.	As recommended in this Draft EIR, above.	Significant